



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,845	10/12/2005	Thierry Chartier	REGIM 3.3-056	8898

530 7590 08/06/2009  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK  
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST  
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER
----------

THROWER, LARRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1791

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/06/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/534,845	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHARTIER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> LARRY THROWER	<b>Art Unit</b> 1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 26, 2009 has been entered.
2. Claims 1 and 12 are amended; claim 13 is canceled. Claims 1-12 and 14-19 are under examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1-12 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
  - The term "under-deflocculated" in claim 1 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "under-deflocculated" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 1791

- The terms "a separate solution" and "a separate filtration solution" in claims 1 and 12, respectively, are unclear because it is unclear what the solutions are separate from. It is unclear if the separate solutions are separate from the mold, the slip, the tank, or some other element. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, and 14-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Goodman *et al.* (US 5,972,263), hereafter Goodman, as evidenced by Applicant's Specification (see Page 3 line 22-24).

- Regarding **Claim 1**, Goodman teaches a process for producing clay compositions for use in slip casting. Goodman teaches a slip casting process wherein a slip (col. 1, lines 22-29) is cast under pressure (col. 2, lines 11-15) to form a deposit (col. 1, lines 40-43), the slip being under-deflocculated (Table 1, cols. 11-12; col. 9, lines 29-40). The slip mixture comprises a solution containing water, clay, and deflocculants (col. 1, lines 22-29; see also col. 1, lines 40-43). The water is sucked out of the slip, i.e. filtered (col. 1, lines 40-43). It is the examiner's position that the water removed

Art Unit: 1791

from the slip contains at least some residual amounts of deflocculant and is separate from the original slip solution prior to filtration.

- Regarding **Claim 2**, Goodman teaches the slip mixture contains a clay mixture (see column 1 line 22-29), i.e. flocculant. Clay based slips are flocculated as evidenced by Applicant's Specification (see Page 3 line 22-24).
- Regarding **Claim 3**, Goodman teaches the slip mixture comprises kaolinitic clay (see column 1 lines 22-29).
- Regarding **Claim 4**, Goodman teaches the slip mixture comprises a variety of clays (see column 1 lines 22-29).
- Regarding **Claim 5**, Goodman teaches the slip mixture comprises quartz (see column 1 lines 22-29).
- Regarding **Claims 6-7**, Goodman teaches using deflocculant of 0.12 wt % (see Table 1 at column 11-12; see also col. 9 lines 29-40).
- Regarding **Claims 9, 11 and 14-18**, Goodman teaches the process of slip casting to form ceramic articles such as tableware made of china (see column 1 line 18-29).  
“[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Art Unit: 1791

- Regarding **Claim 10**, Goodman teaches the process of slip casting to form ceramic articles such as tableware made of china (see column 1 line 18-29).

7. **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marple *et al.* (CA 2,124,863), hereafter Marple.

- Regarding **Claim 12**, Marple teaches a device for producing a ceramic item comprising a mold (see Fig. 1a 10; see also page 6 line 7-13), a first tank suitable for containing a slip (see Fig. 1a at 18; see also page 6 line 15), and a second tank containing a solution (see Fig. 1a at 20; see also page 6 line 15). In addition, Marple teaches a means for alternatively pressure injecting the slip from the first tank and solution from the second tank (see Fig. 1a;s see also page 6 line 17-24; see also page 11 line 17-19).
- In addition, Claim 12 invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph with the phrase “means for injecting under pressure”. The claim limitation “means for injecting under pressure” is being treated under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. Applicant discloses the “means for injecting under pressure” is a sprue (see Specification Page 7 line 1-5). Thus, Applicant has properly invoked 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1791

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 8 and 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman, as applied to claims 1 and 2 above.

- Regarding **Claim 8**, Goodman also teaches that deflocculants control the rheological and casting properties of the slip (see column 1 line 27-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention without undue experimentation to optimize the deflocculant wt% in the slip to obtain the desired rheological and casting properties. "Discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art." *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).
- Regarding **Claim 19**, Goodman teaches the process of slip casting to form ceramic articles such as tableware made of china (see column 1 line 18-29). "[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

***Declaration***

10. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed May 26, 2009 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-12 and 14-19 based upon Goodman and Marple as set forth in the last Office action because: It refer(s) only to the system described in the above referenced application and not to the individual claims of the application. Thus, there is no showing that the arguments presented are commensurate in scope with the claims. See MPEP § 716.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed May 26, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicant argues that Goodman does not disclose casting a slip under pressure into a mold. This argument has been considered but is not persuasive. Goodman teaches "pressure casting" to be well known and further that "[a]pplying a pressure to the slip increases the casting rate in proportion to the applied pressure." (col. 2, lines 11-13). Thus, Goodman clearly discloses "casting a slip under pressure" as recited in independent claim 1.
- Applicant further argues that Goodman does not suggest that the slip is under-deflocculated. This argument has been considered but is not persuasive. Goodman discloses the slip being under-deflocculated at Table 1, cols. 11-12 and col. 9, lines 29-40.



Art Unit: 1791

- Applicant further argues that the claimed invention differs from Goodman in that "Goodman does not disclose a two-stage process, where the second stage includes, after the slip has been cast into a deposit, a separate solution being filtered through the deposit which contains a deflocculant" (emphasis in Applicant's response). This argument has been considered but is not persuasive. Goodman discloses pressure casting (col. 2, lines 11-15) a solution into a mold which forms a deposit ("a skin or cast of clay body", col. 1, lines 39-41) on the mold which increases in thickness as the solution is filtered through the deposit. At any given point in time after the capillary action of the mold begins drawing the deflocculant-containing solution, a deposit is formed on the mold. It is this deposit through which the deflocculant-containing solution is filtered, this solution being separate from the solution which has been drawn through the mold in that it is now separated by the deposit. Once a desired deposit thickness is attained, the filtration is stopped and the remaining slip is drained off (col. 1, lines 41-44). Thus, an under-deflocculated slip is pressure cast into a mold to form a deposit, and once the slip has been cast into a deposit a deflocculant-containing solution is filtered through the deposit, meeting both elements of independent claim 1.
- Applicant further argues "...that Goodman is silent as to a separate solution, which may be added to the slip, already cast into a deposit. The claimed invention, however, involves a suspension, or slip, and a separate solution, which is brought into the mold once the slip has already been cast into a deposit." (emphasis in Applicant's response). This argument is also not commensurate in scope with what

Art Unit: 1791

has been claimed. The instant claims do not require a *separate* solution, nor do they require this solution *to be brought into the mold once the slip has already been cast* into a deposit. There is nothing in the language of the instant claims which would preclude the deflocculant-containing solution from also including the deposit-forming slip. Applicant has failed to distinguish the language of the claims over the teachings of the prior art.

- With regard to claim 12, in response to applicant's argument that Marple *et al.* discloses various process limitations, including mixing slips prior to slip casting, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Such is the case here.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LARRY THROWER whose telephone number is 571-270-5517. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30AM-6PM est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina A. Johnson can be reached on 571-272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Larry Thrower/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Christina Johnson/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791